Remarks

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner:

(1) objected to the Abstract because it does not provide a concise description of the technical disclosure;

(2) objected to Figures 12-14 because they are not listed and described in the Brief Description of the Drawings section;

(3) acknowledged Applicants' reference to U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/874,869, but instructed Applicants to reference the other applications which Serial No. 09/874,869 is a continuation of and to update the status of each parent application (i.e., patent numbers);

(4) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention;

(5) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,702,736;

(6) rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,612,980, 6,241,657 and 5,776,050; and

(7) provisionally rejected claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/653,719.

In response to Item (1) above, Applicants have submitted a new Abstract that is believed to be a concise description of the technical disclosure. Accordingly, the Abstract is believed to be allowable.

In response to Item (2) above, Applicants have amended the specification to insert a description of Figures 12-14 in the Brief Description of the Drawings section.

In response to Item (3) above, Applicants have amended the specification to reference the other applications which 09/874,869 is a continuation of and to update the status of each parent application.

In response to Items (4) and (5) above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the prior art. Applicants believe that the amended claim 1 avoids the technical issues raised by the Examiner and also avoids the statutory type double patenting rejection.

In response to Item 6 above, Applicants have enclosed three (3) terminal disclaimers that are believed to overcome the obvious-type double patenting rejection.

Applicants have not responded to Item (7) above, as it is a provisional rejection and a response is not believed necessary.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret M Slezak 10/19/2005

Margaret M. Slezak, Esq.
Registration No. 55,625
Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.
470 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, MA 02451-1914
Tel. No.: (781) 290-0060

JC/MMS24CON.amd

MMS-24 CON